



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/337,964	06/22/1999	RONALD J. VANDERGEEST	0500.9812021	9761

23418 7590 04/14/2003

VEDDER PRICE KAUFMAN & KAMMHOLZ  
222 N. LASALLE STREET  
CHICAGO, IL 60601

EXAMINER

LANIER, BENJAMIN E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2132

DATE MAILED: 04/14/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/337,964

Applicant(s)

VANDERGEEST, RONALD J.

Examiner

Benjamin E Lanier

Art Unit

2132

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED \_\_\_\_\_ FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. **ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).**

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s).
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

  
GILBERTO BARRON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's argument the final Office Action presents new reasons for rejection is not persuasive because grammatical language of the first and final office actions was apparently misinterpreted. Examiner stated in the previous actions that the personal key archive, server, key generator, and personal key database which acts as a security key manifest. This statement was directed to the entire system containing the cited elements as the security key manifest as was explained in the final Office Action (Page 2, 1st paragraph). With regards to the requested citation, it was cited with the above description in the final Office Action. The requested citation in Linehan is located on Col. 4, line 61- Col. 5, line 39. Applicant's argument the Linehan reference does not utilize any key attribute data that is contained within the configured security key manifest to dynamically control the generation of a new security key for a subscriber through the use of a configured security key manifest is not persuasive because Linehan discloses the key generator generates a new key based on information (key attribute data) received by the key server from a client, and then storing the client key in the key database (Col. 4, line 61 - Col. 5, line 39). Applicant's argument that the Linehan reference does not teach one of at least: key size data, key usage, key maintenance attributes, cryptographic algorithm, subscriber identification data and authentication data contained in the security manifest (claim 15) is not persuasive because Linehan discloses the key server checking the client ticket (authentication information) to verify that the accessing user is permitted to access the data (key usage)(Col. 5, lines 9-16). Applicant's argument that the Linehan reference does not teach updating the security manifest is not persuasive because Linehan discloses that the information in the key database can be updated (Col. 8, lines 1-17) when a file name or any other identifying information is changed. Applicant's argument that the Linehan reference does not teach continuously analyzing the key manifest content is not persuasive because Linehan discloses monitoring the number of files and the time in order to generate new keys (Col. 9, lines 1-10). Examiner asserts time monitoring would be continuous. Applicant's argument that the Peterson reference is not obvious to combine with the Linehan reference is not persuasive because the Peterson reference discloses a system for delivering web content, and the cryptographic keys and authentication information of Linehan can be considered web content..